OPINION 947

PROTOMOMYS TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, 1927 (MAMMALIA): SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Protomomys* Teilhard de Chardin, 1927, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Protomomys* Teilhard de Chardin, 1927 (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1988.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1847)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Drs. M. C. McKenna, Donald E. Russell and D. E. Savage in May 1968. The application was sent to the printer on 29 August 1968 and was published on 17 January 1969 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **25** : 165. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** : 184) and to two specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 9 April 1970 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (70)14 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **25** : 165. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 9 July 1970 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—sixteen (16), received in the following order: Holthuis, Vokes, Bonnet, Simpson, Mayr, Jaczewski, Tortonese, Eisenmann, Evans, Brinck, Mertens, Binder, Melville, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride.

Negative votes—three (3): Lemche, Sabrosky, Starobogatov.

Voting Papers not returned—three (3): do Amaral, Forest, Munroe.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning votes:

Dr. L. B. Holthuis (16.iv.70): "The authors should have made clearer how commonly the name *Teilhardina* has been used. 'Exclusively used' may actually be only once or twice."

Dr. H. Lemche (23.iv.70): "No necessity for setting aside priority in this case has been demonstrated by the applicants."

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (8.vi.70): "Though granting that the proposal of *Protomomys* was anything but admirable, I am opposed in principle to use of plenary powers for such recent names."

Prof. P. Brinck (17.vi.70): "It is a pity that the applicants do not say what they mean by *Teilhardina belgica* 'has been accepted and exclusively used'. A few times only? Is any confusion raised by accepting *Protomomys*?"

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following is the original reference for the name placed on the Official Index by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

Protomomys Teilhard de Chardin, 1927, *Mém. Mus. roy. Hist. nat. Belg.* **36** : 16

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (70)14 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 948.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
8 *October* 1970